

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

FEB 07 2007

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-41 remain in the application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 9, 11, 14, 18, 20, 22, 24, 30, 35, 38 and 41 have been amended.

Applicant believes the amendments add no new matter. Applicant believes the claim amendments are supported at least with respect to page 4:18-30 page 10:18-14, description of Fig. 4, such as page 16:5-25, page 17: 20-28, 18:1-26

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3-6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 32, 34-36, 38-39 and 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker, U.S Patent 6, 113, 492 in view of Chamoff et al., Barakai, et al., Nair, et al and Hedrick et al. The applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Amended claims describe, as recited in claim 1 for example, a master gaming controller mounted within the housing designed or configured to execute player tracking software that allows the master gaming controller to provide player tracking services and to execute a first software application that provides a feature on the gaming machine other than the playing service. The first software application and the player tracking software are each operable to at least receive, at proximately a same time, first event information from a first input device included in the physical devices and are each operable to evaluate whether a response is needed to the first event information wherein the first input device is used in a first context by the player tracking software to provide player tracking services and wherein the first input device is used in a second context by the first software application to provide the feature other than the player tracking services. As described at page 16:10-14, "In addition other types of events, besides player tracking events may be received by the device interfaces 455 because the physical devices 492 may be shared by applications other than player tracking." Thus, a device may be used by one application in a first context and by the player tracking software in another context. As described with respect to FIG.4 of the present application, a player software application and other software applications can be executing where both applications receive common event information and then each application determines whether the event information is relevant to the application. In some instances, the event information may not be relevant to a particular application. An advantage of this approach is that it allows for more efficient uses of the devices on the gaming machine (see 4:18-30).

Examiner relies on Walker to teach the details of a gaming machine. Examiner states the disclosure in Walker does not discuss whether software for the player tracking unit is executed with the MGC or the player tracking unit itself. Chamoff, Barakai, and Nair do not describe gaming machines. The examiner relies on Hedrick to teach a secondary display. The combination of these applications doesn't describe a master gaming controller with limitations recited in the pending claims in particular the references don't describe details as to how event information is handled by software applications executed by the master gaming controller.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 1, 3-6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 32, 34-36, 38-39 and 41 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 9, 10 and 25-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick in further view of Lichtman 5, 819,107.

Examiner relies on Lichtman in regards to software drivers and protocols. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Lichtman does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker and Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick describe above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair, Hedrick and Lichtman, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 9, 10 and 25-31 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick in further view of Boushy 6, 183,362.

Examiner relies on Boushy in regards to networks. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai and Nair and Boushy does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick describe above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair, Hedrick and Boushy, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 13 and 14 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claims 17, 21, 22 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick in further view of Acres 5,702,304.

Examiner relies on Acres to teach details of a player tracking system. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair, Hedrick and Acres does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair, Hedrick and Acres, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 17, 21, 22 and 33 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Walker in View of Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick in further view of Pease (5,766,076) and Kelly (6,293,865).

Examiner relies on Pease and Kelly in regards to input devices. The combination of Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair, Hedrick and Kelly and Pease does not correct the deficiencies described with respect to the combination of Walker and Chamoff, Barakai, Nair and Hedrick above in regards to not teaching all of the limitations of the present invention. Therefore, for at least these reasons, Walker, Chamoff, Barakai, Nair, Hedrick, Pease and Kelly, alone or in combination, can't be said to render obvious claims 20 and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP


David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

Beyer Weaver, LLP
P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100